

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/010,711	11/08/2001	David Jay Smith	1313/1H649-US1	2757
7590 10/17/2003		EXAMINER ELHILO, EISA B		
DARBY & DARBY P.C.				
805 Third Avenue New York, NY 10022			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
•			1751	10
	•		DATE MAILED: 10/17/2003	3

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)	<u>H</u> 2
		\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \	SMITH ET AL.	
٠	Advisory Action	10/010,711		
•		Examiner Eisa B Elhilo	Art Unit	
	The MAILING DATE of this communication ap			<u> </u>
	•		•	
There final condi	REPLY FILED 19 September 2003 FAILS TO Plefore, further action by the applicant is required to rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: ition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appnination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	o avoid abandonment of th : (1) a timely filed amendm peal (with appeal fee); or (is application. A proper reply nent which places the applicati	to a on in
	PERIOD FOR F	REPLY [check either a) or	b)]	
a)	\square The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date	e of the final rejection.		
b)	The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WA 706.07(f).	than SIX MONTHS from the mail	ing date of the final rejection.	
nave b 37 CFI b) abo	xtensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The een filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext R 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shorter ove, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three I patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	tension and the corresponding amened statutory period for reply origin	ount of the fee. The appropriate extensionally set in the final Office action; or (2) a	ion fee under as set forth in
1.	A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellar 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.192(a)).			
2.🛛	The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered	l because:		
(í	a) I they raise new issues that would require fur	ther consideration and/or	search (see NOTE below);	
•	b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note		,,	
•	they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	•	by materially reducing or sim	plifying the
((d) 🛛 they present additional claims without cand	celing a corresponding nur	nber of finally rejected claims.	
	NOTE: Claim 139 as a new claim is presented	l after final rejection .		
3.	Applicant's reply has overcome the following rej	ection(s):		
4.	Newly proposed or amended claim(s) wou canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	uld be allowable if submitte	ed in a separate, timely filed a	mendment
5.🖂	The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request application in condition for allowance because:		en considered but does NOT	place the
6.	The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered to raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	pecause it is not directed S	SOLELY to issues which were	newly
7.	For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendme explanation of how the new or amended claims			d an
	The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follow	vs:		
	Claim(s) allowed: None.			
	Claim(s) objected to: None.			
	Claim(s) rejected: <u>8,33-37 and 53-79</u> .			
	Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 1-7,9-32	2,38-52 and 80-138.		
8.[]			disapproved by the Examine	er.
	Note the attached Information Disclosure Staten	nent(s)(PTO-1449) Paper	No(s). <u>5</u> .	
9.🛛	_			
	Other:			
	Other:			



Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant has not presented any additional data or showing to overcome the rejection of record. The arguments presented in paper No. 9, dated 9/19/2003 merely rehash the arguments presented earlier which were fully responded by the examiner in previous office action in paper No. 8, dated 6,24,2003.

YOGENDAA N. GUPTA SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700